

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by David (US 4,369,587). Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Petersen (US 5,293,698). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over David in view of Fujimaki (US 5,979,890). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Fujimaki. Claims 1 to 6, and 9 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Manley et al. (US 5,186,443) in view of Dhooge et al. (US 4,056,264). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Manley in view of Dhooge and further in view of Fujimaki. Claim 7 was objected to, but was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 7 was objected to, but was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 7 is respectfully requested in view of the following.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by David (US 4,369,587). David discloses a discharge at position A. See col. 6, lines 15 to 18. David also discloses that “air is blown into the central part of the drier and rises between the trays (FIG. 2). It is taken up in the upper part by a horizontal duct 22 then is brought by ducts such as 23 and 24 situated on the two faces of the drier back to the duct-forming chassis 20 where it is again blown between the trays from the bottom. A part of the air is recycled through duct 25.” Col. 5, lines 36 to 42.

Claim 1 recites “A sheet material conveyor comprising:

a pocket conveyor with at least one moving pocket for collecting printed sheet material, the pocket conveyor having a release area for releasing the printing sheet material in the pocket; and an air supply device providing air to the pocket at the release area.”

David does not teach or disclose “an air supply device providing air to the pocket at the release area”, as claimed. No air is provided at area A (see FIG. 6).

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Petersen

(US 5,293,698). Petersen discloses that “[a]t the buffer storage section, a compressed air line 34, located between the buffer storage 33, can readily supply compressed air to the signatures which are fitted into the pockets 15 of the fill packages 36. These pockets, as clearly seen in FIG. 6, are open at the bottom, so that access by compressed air in the direction of the arrow A of FIG. 6 is readily possible. This ensures satisfactory drying.” Col. 5, lines 2 to 9. See also FIG 1. Petersen also discloses that “[a]t the unloading or removal station 35, the compressed or collapsed packages 36 are fanned out by a drive chain 43, operating similarly to the chains 28, 29 but in reverse direction. The signatures 6 now can be removed, in well known manner, for example by gripper chains or the like, and transported individually, for example for subsequent printing. The empty packages 23 are then transferred by transfer chain 41 back into the storage cassette 26.” Col. 5, lines 21 to 30.

Petersen does not teach or disclose “an air supply device providing air to the pocket at the release area.” No air is provided at the unloading or removal station 35.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1 and 9 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over David in view of Fujimaki (US 5,979,890). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Fujimaki. In view of the comments above, withdrawal of these claim rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 6, and 9 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Manley et al. (US 5,186,443) in view of Dhooge et al. (US 4,056,264). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Manley in view of Dhooge and further in view of Fujimaki.

Manley shows a pocket newspaper collator. Dhooge discloses a stack forming device to protect film sheets, and shows blower channels 31 which “result in that the sheets to be stacked, after leaving the surface of the roller 18, are exactly and reproducibly driven towards the abutment member 23 and are canted by the resultant blowing action of the blowers 31 and 26, so that they are gently positioned upon the stack 11.” Col. 5, lines 60 to 65. It is respectfully submitted that element 10 of Dhooge is not a pocket as asserted in the Office Action, but a

device for forming a stack of sheets. Dhooge's air blower also does not prevent contact between a sheet and a wall, but rather with guides 27.

It is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to combine the stationary stacking device for sensitive articles of Dhooge with the movable pocket device of Manley.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1 to 6, and 8 to 15 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940